

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LOWER SALFORD TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY, *et al.*,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY, *et al.*,

Defendant.

Civil Action

No. 11-cv-6489

ORDER

AND NOW, this 7th day of May 2025, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 109), Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 110), the responses thereto, and the Joint Appendix (ECF No. 113), and for the reasons set out in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:¹

1. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 110) is **GRANTED**.
2. Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 109) is **DENIED**.
3. **JUDGMENT** is entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff.
4. The Clerk of Court shall close this case.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Mitchell S. Goldberg
MITCHELL S. GOLDBERG, J.

¹ I note that the parties have requested oral argument. Because, however, I find the administrative record is sufficient to rule on the issues presented in the cross motions for summary judgment, I find that oral argument is not necessary. See 7 Eleven Inc v. Sodhi, 706 F. App'x 777, 779 (3d Cir. 2017) ("The District Court has discretion to determine whether to hold oral argument on a motion."). Accordingly, the parties' request for oral argument (ECF No. 114) is **DENIED**.